

**IMPACTS OF SERVICE QUALITY, SATISFACTION AND
PERSONAL FACTORS ON STUDENT RETENTION IN
OPEN DISTANCE LEARNING INSTITUTIONS IN
MALAYSIA**

NG MAN SAN

OPEN UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

2010

**IMPACTS OF SERVICE QUALITY, SATISFACTION AND PERSONAL
FACTORS ON STUDENT RETENTION IN OPEN DISTANCE
LEARNING INSTITUTIONS IN MALAYSIA**

NG MAN SAN

A thesis submitted in full fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science (Business Administration)

Centre for Graduate Studies
Open University Malaysia

2010

DECLARATION

Name: NG MAN SAN

Matric Number: CGS 00311808

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own work, except quotations and summaries which have been duly acknowledged.

Signature:

Date: 1st October, 2010

IMPACTS OF SERVICE QUALITY, SATISFACTION AND PERSONAL FACTORS ON STUDENT RETENTION IN OPEN DISTANCE LEARNING INSTITUTIONS IN MALAYSIA

NG MAN SAN

October 2010

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the impacts of service quality, student satisfaction and personal factors on student intention to complete study in open distance learning (ODL) institutions. A cross-sectional survey design was employed in this study. Data was collected during the period from October to December, 2009 from a nation-wide random sample of 450 Open University Malaysia (OUM) undergraduate students. Several statistical techniques were used to analyse the data and they include producing frequency counts for generating descriptive statistics. In addition, factor analysis was used to identify and confirm the factors of service quality, student satisfaction and student retention. Multivariate analysis was also used for testing hypotheses and measuring the impacts of factors on student retention. The study findings based on 342 usable questionnaires indicated that service quality and its four dimensions (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, and assurance) had positive impacts on overall satisfaction. However, the empathy dimension did not have any effect. Five factors were found to have effects on student intention to complete study in OUM. They were: student satisfaction, goal commitment, family support, study habits and number of semesters attended. However, service quality had no effect. The findings indicated that low student retention in ODL institutions was attributed not only to student satisfaction but also to a combination of personal factors. It follows that the key to an effective retention strategy is for ODL institutions to provide quality support services that meet the satisfaction of the students. Additionally, ODL institutions should help the students to overcome their personal problems.

Keywords: Service Quality, Satisfaction, Retention, SERVPERF, Factor Analysis

IMPAK PERKHIDMATAN KUALITI, KEPUASAN DAN FAKTOR-FAKTOR PERIBADI KE ATAS RETENSI PELAJAR DI INSTITUSI-INSTITUSI PEMBELAJARAN TERBUKA DAN JARAK JAUH DI MALAYSIA

NG MAN SAN

October 2010

ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengenal pasti impak perkhidmatan kualiti, kepuasan pelajar dan faktor-faktor peribadi ke atas keinginan menyelesaikan pengajian di institusi-institusi pembelajaran terbuka dan jarak jauh (ODL). Satu reka bentuk tinjauan selidik keratan rentas, telah digunakan dalam kajian ini. Data telah dikumpulkan dalam tempoh Oktober hingga Disember 2009 daripada sampel rawak yang melibatkan 450 orang pelajar di seluruh negara. Beberapa teknik statistik telah digunakan untuk menganalisa data tersebut. Ini termasuk mengeluarkan kiraan kekerapan bagi menghasilkan statistik perihalan. Di samping itu, analisis faktor digunakan untuk mengenal pasti dan mengesahkan faktor-faktor kualiti perkhidmatan, kepuasan pelajar dan retensi pelajar. Analisis multivariat juga digunakan untuk pengujian hipotesis dan pengukuran impak faktor-faktor retensi pelajar. Hasil kajian yang berdasarkan 342 soalselidik yang boleh digunapakai, menunjukkan kualiti perkhidmatan dan empat dimensi (“tangibility”, “reliability”, “responsiveness” dan “assurance”) mempunyai impak positif ke atas kepuasan keseluruhan. Walau bagaimanapun, dimensi empati tidak mempunyai sebarang kesan. Lima faktor didapati mempunyai kesan ke atas keinginan pelajar untuk menyelesaikan pengajian di OUM. Kesan-kesan ini ialah: kepuasan pelajar, komitmen pencapaian, sokongan keluarga, tabiat belajar dan bilangan semester yang dihadiri. Walau bagaimanapun, kualiti perkhidmatan tidak mempunyai sebarang kesan. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa retensi pelajar yang rendah di institusi ODL bukan sahaja disebabkan kepuasan pelajar tetapi juga disebabkan kombinasi beberapa faktor peribadi. Sehubungan itu, kunci bagi satu strategi pengekalan yang berkesan ialah untuk institusi-institusi ODL memberi sokongan perkhidmatan berkualiti kepada pelajar-pelajar. Selain itu, institusi-institusi ODL harus membantu pelajar mengatasi masalah peribadi yang berkaitan dengan pengajian mereka.

Kata Kunci: Perkhidmatan Kualiti, Kepuasan, Retensi, SERVPERF, Analisis Faktor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During my lengthy and challenging journey towards completing this thesis, I have learned many valuable lessons. The lessons, though not pleasant at the time, helped me to understand and appreciate the true essence of academic and institutional research. Beyond these valuable lessons, I eagerly acknowledge my indebtedness and sincere gratitude to the many individuals who have helped make this thesis possible. They include my supervisor, colleagues, friends and many others whose names may not even be recorded in this acknowledgement page. First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Latifah Binti Abdol Latif for her guidance, advice and support while conducting this study. I am also extremely grateful to Professor Ramli Bin Bahroom and my supervisor for their expert review of the instruments used in my research and their constructive comments. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to the students of Open University Malaysia (OUM) for their participation, cooperation and support in providing valuable data required for this research. I also wish to record my appreciation to OUM and its Centre of Student Management (CSM) for providing me with the relevant data and computing and other facilities needed to conduct my research.

I would like to extend my deepest appreciation to my friends and colleagues in and outside OUM for their encouragement and support. I gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Kate Van. Thanks for her thoughtful encouragement and advice to persist in my research as well as valuable technical support throughout the duration of this study. Last but not least, my Special Thanks to my daughters, Mei Yee and Lai Yee for their continuous encouragement, support and having faith in me to complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	
	1.1	Background 1
	1.2	Statement of the Problem 4
	1.3	Rationale of the Study 6
	1.4	Main Objective of the Study 6
	1.5	Specific Objectives of the Study 6
	1.6	Significance of the Study 7
	1.7	Scope of the Study 7
	1.8	The Open University of Malaysia 8
	1.9	Definitions and Terms 10
	1.10	Limitations 11
	1.11	Organisation of the Thesis 11
	1.12	Summary 12
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	
	2.1	Introduction 13
	2.2	Theories Related to Student Retention 13
	2.2.1	The Spady Model (1970) 14
	2.2.2	The Tinto Model (1975) 15
	2.2.3	The Bean and Metzner Model (1985) 16
	2.2.4	The Kember Model (1989) 17
	2.2.5	The Student Satisfaction/Retention Model (1997) 18
	2.2.6	The Service Quality Model 19
	2.3	Variables Related to Student Retention 19
	2.3.1	Service Quality 20
	2.3.2	Student Satisfaction 27
	2.3.3	Student Intention to Complete Studies 30
	2.4	Personal Factors 31
	2.4.1	Family Support 32
	2.4.2	Goal Commitment 33
	2.4.3	Number of Semesters Attended 34
	2.4.4	Study Habits 34
	2.5	Past Studies Outside Malaysia 35
	2.6	Past Studies in Malaysia 39
	2.7	Summary 40

CHAPTER 3	METHODOLOGY	
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Research Questions (RQ)	43
3.3	Proposed Conceptual Framework	44
3.4	Research Design	47
3.5	Study Population and Sampling Frame	47
3.6	Sampling Design	48
3.7	Sample Size and Selection	48
3.8	Questionnaire and Pilot Tests	49
3.9	Data Collection	52
3.10	Data Preparation	53
3.11	Data Analysis Method	54
3.11.1	Descriptive Statistics	54
3.11.2	Factor Analysis	55
3.11.3	Evaluating the SERVPERF	55
3.11.4	Evaluating Overall Quality and Satisfaction	57
3.11.5	Testing Hypotheses H1 to H5	57
3.11.6	Testing Hypotheses H6 to H11	59
3.12	Summary	60
CHAPTER 4	DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	
4.1	Introduction	62
4.2	Response Rate	62
4.3	Respondents' Profile	63
4.4	Evaluating the SERVPERF Instrument	65
4.5	Evaluating Overall Quality, Student Satisfaction and Retention Intention	70
4.6	Performance Ratings of Service Quality	71
4.7	Impacts of Dimensions of Service Quality on Student Satisfaction (Hypotheses H1 to H5)	71
4.8	Impacts of Service Quality, Student Satisfaction and Personal Factors on Intention to Complete Studies (Hypotheses H6 to H11)	76
4.9	Summary	79
CHAPTER 5	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
5.1	Introduction	81
5.2	Summary of Findings	81
5.2.1	Problem	81
5.2.2	Methodology	82
5.2.3	Descriptive Statistics	83
5.2.4	The SERVPERF Instrument	83
5.2.5	Results for Research Question 1	84
5.2.6	Results for Research Question 2	86
5.2.7	Results for Research Question 3	87
5.2.8	Summary of Results	89
5.3	Discussion: Implications of Study Findings	90
5.4	Recommendations for Further Research Studies	97
5.5	Summary and Conclusion	99

REFERENCES	102
APPENDICES	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Service quality statements classified according to five dimensions of service quality	52
Table 3.2: Goodness-of-fit indices for testing of the SERVPERF model	57
Table 3.3: Expected output of hypotheses testing (H1 to H5)	59
Table 3.4: Expected output of hypotheses testing (H6 to H15)	60
Table 4.1: Distribution of respondents by state/region	63
Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by ethnicity and gender	64
Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents by age group and employment	64
Table 4.4: Factor loadings for service quality	67
Table 4.5: Standardised regression weights/factor loadings	68
Table 4.6: Average variance extracted (AVEs) for discriminant validity analysis of service quality dimensions	69
Table 4.7: Goodness-of-fit indices for testing of the SERVPERF model	70
Table 4.8: Skewness and kurtosis indices for service quality dimensions	71
Table 4.9: Results of hypotheses testing (H1 to H5)	73
Table 4.10 Results of hypotheses testing (H6 to H11)	77

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1:Conceptual framework of student intention to complete study	45
--	----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AeU	Asia e-University
AVE	Average variance extracted
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CFI	Comparative fit index
EFA	Exploratory factor analysis
Ha	Alternative hypothesis
HEIs	Higher education institutions
Ho	Null hypothesis
ICT	Information, technology and communication
MMU	Multimedia University
NFI	Normed fit index
ODL	Open Distance Learning
OUM	Open University Malaysia
PGFI	Parsimony Goodness-of-fit Index
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of approximation
MCE/SPM	Malaysian Certificate of Education/Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia
MHCE/STPM	Malaysian Higher Certificate of Education/Sijil Tinggi Pelajaran Malaysia
UiTM	Universiti Technology Mara
UKM	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
UM	University of Malaya
UNIRAZAK	Universiti Tun Abdul Razak

UNITAR	Universiti Tun Abdul Razak
UPM	Universiti Putra Malaysia
USM	Universiti Sains Malaysia
UTM	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
WOU	Wawasan Open University
VIF	Variance inflation factor

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In its aspiration to become a developed nation by 2020, Malaysia has embarked on an initiative to democratise higher education; this initiative targets two-fifths of the country's population in the 17-23 years age group, and one-third of the labour force to receive tertiary education by 2010 (Ministry of Higher Education, 2004). In response to this initiative and with the advent of rapid information and communication technology (ICT) change, higher education institutions (HEIs) have been increasing opportunities to meet society demands for tertiary education. In addition, HEIs have also been improving the system of delivering higher education by offering distance learning courses and programmes. With distance learning, students are now able "to learn from a distance with physical separation between them and their teacher during education delivery and to focus on independent and self-direction study" (Holmberg, 1980).

In democratising higher education, the government has also introduced policies that allow for the establishment of private higher education institutions (PHEIs) along with the growth of public funded universities. In the last decade, this development has led to an emergence of two categories of education institutions as the providers to support the

distance education sector. The first category refers to institutions of dual modes. In addition to conducting regular campus-based and classroom-type courses, the dual-mode institutions also offer programmes via distance learning. Included in this category are the majority of the twenty public funded universities for example, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), University of Malaya (UM), Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM), and Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), and at least two private universities that is, Multimedia University (MMU) and International Medical University (IMU).

The second type of HEIs refers to the single-mode open and distance learning (ODL) institutions which are privately funded and which conduct all their courses and programmes via distance learning. There are currently four ODL universities in the country, namely Open University Malaysia (OUM), Universiti Tun Abdul Razak (UNIRAZAK) or previously know by the acronym UNITAR, Wawasan Open University (WOU) and Asia E-University (AeU). These ODL universities are classified as 'open' as they are permitted by the government to admit students under the open entry system; that is, students can be admitted to undergraduate programmes on the basis of the PMR/SRP/LCE qualification or equivalent and prior working experience.

Each of these four ODL universities operates under slightly different systems of delivering distance education. Established in 1998, UNIRAZAK initially operated as an institution that provided distance education programmes via ICT media and the internet (Alhabshi & Hakim, 2006). Currently UNIRAZAK offers face-to-face classes combined with the effective use of web-based courseware and online tutorials. OUM was established in 2000, just two years after UNIRAZAK. As Malaysia's first open distance university, OUM offers a blended mode with face-to-face teaching combined with

internet-based delivery of instructions from the lecturers to the students. WOU was established in 2007. Like OUM, WOU employs a flexible mode that incorporates e-learning as a means to help the students study at their own pace without leaving their employment or compromising other commitments. AeU, formed in 2008, is the latest ODL institution in Malaysia. It is an international university that collaborates with institutions of higher learning in 31 Asian countries through ODLs. AeU relies on the ICT to deliver distance education as well as face-to-face teaching.

The four ODL universities are privately owned and hence depend mainly on tuition fees to fund their operations. In order for the ODL institutions to generate business profits or even to maintain their economic existence, they need to have sufficient students. In contrast, the existence of the public universities is not driven by student enrolment. Revenue from tuition fees as a business issue does not seriously arise for these public universities as they are financed by the government.

Study programmes offered by ODL institutions appeal to the population masses, particularly working adults who aspire to improve their academic qualifications in order to secure better careers and quality of life. This is because ODL programmes are flexible, convenient and affordable (Ali, 2005). Consequently, there has been a rapid increase of distance student enrolment in these ODL institutions. The researcher estimated from the ODL institutions' websites, that the cumulative ODL enrolment has now exceeded 100,000 students; this suggests that distance education forms a significant component of the national educational system.

However, despite the large enrolment size, ODL institutions face the common problem

of large withdrawal of students before completing their studies and earning a degree. The benefits of distance learning which include upgrading the nation's workforce and increasing individual income, are reduced by pre-mature withdrawal of students. Business income of ODL institutions can also be affected by poor student retention. Pre-mature withdrawal of students or poor student retention is therefore a major business issue faced by all ODL institutions. The present study is designed to focus on this issue.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The existence of many HEIs in the education market has created a buyers' market; students are now in the position to choose the university they wish to study. Given the highly competitive education market, ODL institutions need to overcome two challenges in order to make profits or to maintain their existence. The first challenge is that ODL institutions need to compete successfully for adequate intake of students. The second challenge is to determine a way for preventing their existing students from leaving the institutions. It is the second challenge of retaining the existing students that is the concern for this study.

As noted earlier, there is an indication that large numbers of students leave their ODL institutions every year without completing their studies. For example, OUM, the largest of the four ODL institutions, registered about 20 percent of student attrition in 2004 (Bahroom & Abdol Latif, 2005). The student attrition situation has not improved but has in fact worsened for example, to 27 percent in 2007 (Abdol Latif & Fadzil, 2007). Low student retention affects the business operation of ODL institutions because it means a loss in future revenue. For example, a decline of one per cent in student retention in OUM would result in a reduction of RM4.5 million of revenue from tuition

fees for a degree programme (Abdol Latif, 2009). In addition, poor student retention would project the institutions with poor image, dented reputation and inferior quality in the study programmes (Hossler, 2005; Moody, 2004). These negative perceptions about the ODL institutions would erode institutional competitiveness, which if not arrested would in turn lead to failure of sustaining their business operations. Poor student retention is therefore viewed by ODL institutions as a serious business problem; this is reflected by many of the retention initiatives introduced by them. For example in OUM, a special committee has been set up in 2005; the special committee has since been active to find ways and means of reducing student attrition (Abdol Latif & Fadzil, 2007).

It is clear from the above discussion that one of the most challenging problems faced by ODL institutions in Malaysia is how to retain the students throughout their study programmes. In the services sector, firms also encounter customer retention problem. To overcome the customer retention problem, firms apply customer relationship marketing principles to build up business relationship with their customers, which in turn would lead to improved customer satisfaction and retention. The researcher is of the opinion that similar marketing approach can be applied to overcome the problem of student retention in ODL institutions in Malaysia.

The approach of applying marketing principles would require the ODL institutions to offer quality services and to improve student satisfaction with the services provided. However, there appears to be an inadequate or lack of empirical information reported in the literature to support this approach within the Malaysian ODL environment. To fill the data void, this study was conducted to investigate whether service quality and

student satisfaction affect the retention of ODL students in Malaysia based on data collected from a sample of OUM students.

1.3 Rationale of the Study

The purpose of carrying out this study is to provide the ODL institutions and researchers with information that can be used to better manage student retention and to conduct further research on ODL institutions. The information that is expected to be generated from this study includes empirical information concerning the relationship of service quality, student satisfaction and personal factors with student intention to complete studies in ODL institutions. Educationists and administrators could use the information obtained to improve the quality of services and student satisfaction, and to find ways to help minimise personal problems faced by the students.

1.4 Main Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study was to determine the relationship of service quality and student satisfaction with student intention to complete studies in OUM.

1.5 Specific Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study were:

- a) To determine the positive impacts of service quality dimensions on student satisfaction in OUM.
- b) To determine the positive impacts of service quality and student satisfaction on student intention to complete studies in OUM.

- c) To determine the positive impacts of goal commitment, family support, number of semesters attended and study habits on student intention to complete studies in OUM.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is significant as it can contribute towards the following:

- a) The study is expected to operationalise the construct of service quality within an ODL setting, and this could form the operational definition for future studies in related areas concerning distance learning.
- b) The research findings are expected to add to the growing body of knowledge pertaining to education, marketing and improvement of student retention in distance learning. In particular, the research findings would lead to a better understanding of issues related to service quality, student satisfaction, personal factors and student retention, the inter-relationships among the constructs of interest and their impacts on student retention within the context of Malaysian ODL institutions.
- c) The results of the study could be used as a guide for determining areas in distance learning which need improvement and where students are currently not satisfied with.
- d) The study makes a case on the practical usefulness of conducting institutional research in distance learning.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The study was confined to OUM. As the largest of the four ODL institutions in Malaysia, OUM is the representative distance learning model of the ODL sector. In general, the nature of the problems faced by OUM is no different from that encountered by the other ODL three institutions though the magnitude might vary among them.

Therefore, the findings obtained concerning OUM in the study are likely to be useful to the entire ODL sector for improving distance learning enrolment.

There are two groups of students studying the various programmes in OUM. They are the undergraduate students and postgraduate students. More than half of the undergraduates are teachers under the special Ministry of Education-OUM education programmes and the rest are students in the open market diploma and degree programmes. Students in the open market programmes registered a much higher attrition rate as compared with that recorded for the teacher-students. This study focused only on the undergraduate students in the open market programmes, thus excluding the teacher-students and the postgraduate students. The unit of analysis for the study therefore referred to this group of OUM undergraduate students in the open market programmes.

1.8 The Open University of Malaysia

In this section, a brief review of the profile of OUM is given. Established in the year 2000, OUM is Malaysia's first ODL institution, and seventh private university. The missions of OUM are (a) to be the leading contributor in democratising education, (b) to develop quality education through multi-mode learning technologies, and (c) to develop and enhance learning experiences towards the development of a knowledge-based society. It is driven by its motto, "University for All". It is marketed as Malaysia's preferred choice to earn a degree for individuals who are working and unable to leave their full-time jobs or businesses.

OUM offers a blended learning mode that combines printed learning materials as the main learning resource supplemented by face-to-face interactions at regional centres and e-learning through a specially designed Learning Management System (Ali, 2005). Through e-learning, ICT is used to connect learners and the tutors apart from the face-to-face-tutorial sessions. Thus, learners are able to benefit academically from the online communities of learning, learning from and with each other as well as socialising with each other, and communicating with their tutors.

More than fifty learning centres have been established throughout Malaysia to provide learning facilities to learners of OUM. This approach of decentralisation provides a strategic convenience and support for learning to the students as enquiries concerning both academic and non-academic matters could be directed to the staff manning the local learning centres.

OUM emphasises on quality of education and providing its learners with an enriching and rewarding number of semesters attended throughout their study years. OUM achieves this by offering diverse support systems and services such as a learner services centre, a digital library, a learning management system (myLMS), an integrated student management system, distributed learning centres, ICT services and academic counselling services.

OUM offers more than seventy programmes which include business studies, sciences, information technology and communication, education and language, nursing and applied social science studies. These programmes are offered at three academic levels, namely diploma, undergraduate degree and post-graduate degree programmes,

1.9 Definitions and Terms

- a) Distance learning: Distance learning or distance education is defined as the instruction where “students and teachers are separated by distance and sometimes by time” (Moore & Kearsley, 1996). It is designed to deliver education to students who are not physically “on site”.
- b) Open entry system: Under the open entry system, the Government permits the distance learning institution to admit students on the basis of the PMR/SRP/LCE qualification and prior learning, training and life experience.
- c) Learners’ (students’) retention: Occurs when students complete, continue or resume their studies in an ODL university. It is the opposite of Learners’ (students’) attrition.
- d) Blended learning mode: Distance learning may take the form of blended learning mode by combining it with e-learning and self study. Blended learning mode is commonly practised in all the ODL institutions in Malaysia.
- e) Confirmatory analysis: Use of a multivariate technique to test (confirm) a pre-specified relationship. It is the opposite of exploratory analysis.
- f) Exploratory analysis: Analysis which defines possible relationships in only the most general form and then allowing the multivariate technique to estimate relationships.
- g) Construct: Unobserved or latent concept that the researcher can define in conceptual terms but cannot be directly measured, and must be approximately measured by multiple indicators.
- h) Goodness-of-fit (GOF) Measure indicating how well a specified model reproduces the covariance matrix among the indicator variables.

1.10 Limitations

A few limitations of this study are noted. First of all, the target population from which the sample was selected consisted only of the undergraduate students of OUM from the open market. Accordingly, the results obtained in the study may not be entirely applicable to the teacher-students (sponsored by the Ministry of Education), post graduate students of OUM and students of the traditional universities that offer distance learning programmes.

The second limitation of the study is that students were assumed to be the primary customers of ODL institutions. However, a more inclusive study should include all internal and external stakeholders including academic, administrative, and staff.

Another limitation is that the validity of the data collected may be affected by possible inaccurate answers provided by the respondents. Even though the questionnaire was pilot tested and the respondents were promised anonymity, some invalid data may still be collected in any questionnaire survey due to respondents' misunderstanding of the questions and their unwillingness to provide accurate answers.

1.11 Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study. Chapter 2 reviews the literature on the theoretical background of service quality, student satisfaction and retention as well as past research studies on student retention. Chapter 3 explains the theoretical framework, research hypotheses, and the methodology employed by the researcher in the study. Chapter 4 explains the results of statistical

analysis performed for the study. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the findings of the study, recommendations and conclusions of the study.

1.12 Summary

In this chapter, the researcher has stated the problem to be studied in this research and the rationale for conducting the study. The researcher has also explained the main and specific objectives, significance and limitations of the study. The definitions of the key terms used in the study have also been given. Thus, a general overview of the research problem has been delineated. In Chapter 2, the literature relating to the study is reviewed.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: HEdPerf versus SERVPERF. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 24(1), 31-47.
- Abdullah, F. (2005). HEdPERF versus SERVPERF: the quest for ideal measuring instrument of service quality in higher education sector. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13(4), 305-28.
- Abu Hasan, H. F., Allias, A., Abd. Rahman, et al. (2008). Service quality and student satisfaction: A case study at private higher education institutions. *International Business Research*, 1(3), 163-175.
- Ackerman, R. & Schribrowsky, J. (2008). A business marketing strategy applied to student retention: a higher education perspective. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 9(3), 307-336.
- Abdol Latif, L., Bahroom, R., & Sungsri, S. (2009), Managing retention in ODL institutions: A case study on Open University Malaysia and Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, *Asean Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, 1(1).
- Abdol Latif, L. (2009). Learning experience as a key competitive factor. Power Point Slides, Open University Malaysia, Centre for Student Management.
- Abdol Latif, L., Bahroom, R., Yaacob, N. A. & Ng, M. S. (2007), Institutional strengths and challenges from the learners' perspective. *The 21st Asian Association of Open Universities (AAOU) Annual Conference 2007*, 29-31 October, Putrajaya Marriott Hotel, Putrajaya
- Abdol Latif, L. & Fadzil, M. (2007). Retention Initiatives at Open University Malaysia; Past, Present and Future, *The 21st Asian Association of Open Universities (AAOU) Annual Conference 2007*, 29-31 October, Putrajaya Marriott Hotel, Putrajaya.
- Abdol Latif, L. (2005). *Proposed intervention for student retention, 2005*. Working Paper. Open University Malaysia, Centre for Student Management.
- Abdul-Rahman, Z. (1994). Factors related to completion of distance education courses in the off-campus degree program at the University Sains of Malaysia, PhD Dissertation, North Carolina State
- Ajzen, I. & Martin F. (1980), *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Prentice.-Hall; Upper-Saddler, NJ.

- Alhabshi, S O & Hakim, H (2006) Universiti Tun Abdul Razak (UNITAR), Malaysia. In D'Antoni, S. (ed) *The Virtual University: Models and Messages, Lessons from Case Studies*. UNESCO, Paris
- Ali, A. (2005). Malaysian Higher Education: An international perspective. *ICDE Conference, November, 2005*, New Delhi, India.
- Angell, R.J., Heffernan, T. W. & Megicks, P. (2008). Service quality in postgraduate education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(3), 236 – 254
- Armstrong J. S. & Overton T. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, XIV, 396 -402.
- Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*, San Francisco, Jossey- Bass.
- Athiyaman, A. (1997). Linking student satisfaction and service quality perceptions: the case of university education. *European Journal of Marketing*. 31(7), 528-540.
- Bahroom, R., Abdol Latif, L. & Ng, M. S. (2008). Tracking institutional performance using importance-performance analysis, *ASAIHL. International Conference 2008*. Sukhothai Thammthirat Open University. 7-10 April, 2006.
- Bahroom, R. & Abdol Latif, L. (2005), Student satisfaction survey: Towards a learner-centred support services. *South East Asia Association for Institutional Research (SEAAIR) Annual Conference 2005*, 14-16, September, Bali, Indonesia.
- Barnes, B.R. (2005). Analysing service quality: The case of post-graduate Chinese students. *Quality Assurance & Total Quality Management*. 2(2). December 2005
- Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182.
- Bean, J., & Metzner, B. (1985). A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 485-540.
- Bean, J. (1980). Dropouts and turnover: The synthesis and test of a causal model of student attrition. *Research in Higher Education*, 12(2), 155-187.
- Bitner, M.J. (1990). Evaluating service encounters: the effects of physical surroundings and employee responses, *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 69-82.
- Blaikie, N. (2003). *Analyzing quantitative data from description to explanation*, Sage Publication Ltd, London, UK.
- Berry, L.L., (1980). Services marketing is different. *Business Week*. May- June, 1980.

- Billings, D.M., (1986). *Factors related to progress toward completion of correspondence courses in a baccalaureate nursing program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Bolton, R.N. & Drew, J.H., (1991). A longitudinal analysis of the impact of service changes on customer attitudes. *Journal of Marketing*, 55(1), 1-9.
- Brindley, J. E., (1987). *Attrition and completion in distance education: the student's perspective*, Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 322 887).
- Burhanudin, L. S. M. & Alfian, D. R. (2007). Drivers of student loyalty: The case of state university students. *8th Annual SEAAIR Conference*, 4-6 November 2008, Surabaya, Indonesia.
- Carman, J.M. (1990). Consumer perceptions of service quality: an assessment of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Retailing*, 66. 33-55.
- Carr, S. (2000). As distance education comes of age, the challenge is keeping the students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(23).
- Carrillat, F.A., Jaramillo, F., & Mulki, J.P. (2007). The validity of the SERVQUAL and SERVPERF scales: A meta-analytic view of 17 years of research across five countries. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*. 18(5), 472-490
- Carver, R. & Nash, J. G., (2000). *Doing data analysis with SPSS*. Duxbury, Pacific Grove, CA.
- Caruana, A. (2002). Service quality: The effects of service quality and the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(7/8), 811- 828
- Cheng, Y.C., Tam, W.M. (1997). Multi-models of quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5(1), 22-32.
- Cochran W.G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*, John Wiley & Sons, New York
- Cronin, J.J., Taylor, S.A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a re-examination and extension, *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 55-68.
- Crosby, P.B. (1979). *Quality Is free: The art of making quality certain*, New American Library, New York, NY.
- Cueo, J. Academic and advisement and student retention: Empirical connections and systematic interventions. Retrieved from [http:// uwc.edu/esfy/cueo/Academic Advisement and Student Retention.doc](http://uwc.edu/esfy/cueo/AcademicAdvisementandStudentRetention.doc).
- Cui, C. C. (2003). Service quality measurement in the banking sector in South Korea, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 21(4), 191-201.

- Cuthbert, P. F. (1996), Managing service quality in HE: Is SERVQUAL the answer? *Managing Service Quality*, 6(3), 31-35.
- DeShields, O.W. Jr, Kara, A. & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(2), 128-39.
- De Vaus, D. (2004). *Analyzing social science data: 50 key problems in data analysis*, Sage Publications Ltd. London
- Diaz, D.P. (May/June, 2002). Online drop rates revisited. Retrieved from http://technology source.org/article/online_drop_rates_revisited/
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. (J.Spaulding, & G. Simpson, Trans.) New York: The Free Press.
- Elliot, K.M. (2003). Key determinants of student satisfaction. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 4(3)
- Elliot, K.M., & Healy, M.A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(4).
- Elliott, K. M., Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 24(2), 197-209.
- Fadzil, M. & Abdol Latif, L. (2009). Enhancing institutional effectiveness and efficiency: A case for Open University Malaysia, *ISO DE Beijing*, China 14-14 October, 2009
- Feigenbaum, A.V. (1951). *Quality control: Principles, practice, and administration*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*, Addison Wesley. Reading, MA.
- Ford, J.B., Joseph, M. & Joseph, B (1999). Importance-performance analysis as a strategic tool for service marketers: The case of service quality perceptions of business students in New Zealand and USA. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13(2), 171 – 186.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, XXVII (February), 39-50.
- Fozdar, B.I., Kumar, L.S., & Kannan, S. (2006). A survey of study on the reasons responsible for student dropout from the Bachelor of Science programme at Indira Gandhi National Open University. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 7(3).

- Gibbs G., Regan,P & Simpson, O. (2006/2007). Improving student retention through evidence-based proactive systems at the Open University (UK). *Journal of College Student Retention*, 8(3), 359,376.
- Gohn, L., Swartz, J. & Donnelly, S. (2000/2001). A case study of second year student perspective, *Journal of College Student Retention* 2 (4), 271-294.
- Graunke, S.S. & Woosley, S.A. (2005). An exploration of the factors that affect the academic success of college sophomores. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 39 (2), 367-76.
- Gremler, D.D. & Brown, S.W. (1996), "Service loyalty: its nature, importance and implementations", in Edvardsson, B., *Advancing Service Quality: A Global Perspective*, International Service Quality Association, NY, 171-80
- Grönroos, C. (1988). Service quality: the six criteria of good perceived service quality, *Review of Business*, 9 (3), 10-13
- Gummerus, J. et.al (2004). Customer loyalty to content-based web sites: the case of an online health-care service, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18 (3), 175 – 186
- Hair, J.F. Jr, Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E. & Tatham, R.L. (2006), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ,
- Hanssemark, O.G., & Albinsson M. (2004). Customer satisfaction and retention: the experience of individual employees, *Managing Service Quality*, 14 (1), 40-57
- Helgesen, Ø. & Nettet, E. (2007a). What accounts for students' loyalty? Some field study evidence, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21 (2).
- Helgesen, Ø. & Nettet, E. (2007b). Images, satisfaction and antecedents: Drivers of student loyalty? A case of a Norwegian College, *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10 (1).
- Henning-Thurau,T., Lager, M.F. & Hansen, U. (2001). Modelling and managing student loyalty: an approach based on the concept of relationship quality, *Journal of Service Research*, 3 (1), 331-44.
- Hendel, D.D. (2006/2007). Efficacy of participation in a first yeat seminar on student satisfaction and retention, *Journal of College Student Retention* 8 (4), 413-423.
- Heskett, J., Jones, T., Loveman, G., Sassar, W., & Schlesinger, L. (2008). Putting the service-profit chain to work, *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 2008
- Hill, F. M., (1995). Managing service quality in higher education: the role of student as primary consumer. *Quality in Assurance Education*, 3 (3), 10-21
- Holmberg, B (1980), Aspects of distance education, *Comparative Education*, 16,107-16.

- Hossler, D., (2005). Managing student retention: Is the glass half full, half empty, or simply empty? *College and university journal*, 81(2), 11-14.
- Howard, J.A. & Sheth, J.N. (1969). *The theory of buyer behavior*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Jain, S.J., & Gupta, G (2004). Measuring service quality: SERVQUAL vs. SERVPERF scales , *Vikalpa*, 29 (2) April-June, 2004.
- Joseph, M., & Joseph, B. (1997). Service quality in education: A student perspective, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5 (1), 15-21
- Juran, J.M. & Gryna, F.M. Jr (Eds), (1988), *Juran's Quality Control Handbook*, 4th Ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Kang, G.D. & James J. (2004) Service quality dimensions: an examination of Gronroos's model, *Managing Service Quality*, 14 (4), 266-277
- Keaveney, S.M. & Young, C.E. (1997). *The student satisfaction and retention model (SSRM)*. Working Paper, University of Colorado at Denver Graduate School of Business
- Kember, D. (1989). A longitudinal-process model of drop-out from distance education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60(3), 278-301.
- Kember, D. (1995). *Open learning courses for adults: A model of student progress*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Kennedy, D., and Powell, R. (1976). Student progress and withdrawal in the Open University. *Teaching at a Distance*, 7, 61-75
- Knoell, D.M. (1966). *A critical review of research on the college dropout*. In the *College Dropout and the Utilization of Talent*, edited by L. A. Pervin, L.E. Reik., and W. Dalrymple. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Khoo C.S. & Idrus, R. (2003). Student satisfaction in Malaysia: Customer-focused learner support, *The Asian society of Open and Distance Education*, 1 (1).
- Kotler, P., Fox, K.F.A. (1995), *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ
- Langrosen, S., Swyyed-Hashemi, R. & Leitner, M. (2004). Examination of the dimensions of quality in higher education, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 12 (2), 61-69.
- Locke, E., A., (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3 (2), 109-216

- Yildiz, S. & Kara, A. (2009). The PESPERF scale: An instrument for measuring service quality in the School of Physical Education and Sports. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 17 (4), 393-415
- Martilla, J.A. & James, J.C. (1977). Importance-performance analysis, *Journal of Marketing*, 41 (January), 77-79.
- Marzo-Navarro, M., Pedraja-Iglesias, M. & Rivera-Torres, P. (2005a). A new management element for universities: satisfaction with the offered courses, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19 (6), 505-26.
- Marzo-Navarro, M., Pedraja-Iglesias, M. & Rivera-Torres, P. (2005b). Measuring customer satisfaction in summer courses, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13 (1), 53-65.
- McGivney, V. (1996), *Staying or leaving the course: Non-completion and retention of mature students in future and higher education*. Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education.
- Mendenhall W. & Sincich T. (2003), *A Second Course in Statistics Regression Analysis*, Pearson Prentice-Hall, Malaysia.
- Ministry of Higher Education (2004). *Strategic plan for national higher education*.
- Moody, J. (2004) Distance Education: Why are the attrition rates so high: *Quarterly Review of Distance Learning*, 5(3), 205-210.
- Moore, M.G. & G. Kearsley (1996), *Distance education: A systems view*. Belmont, Ca. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1988). *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw-Hill, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Oldfield, B.M. & Baron, S. (2000). Student perceptions of service quality in a U.K. university business and management faculty, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 8 (2), 85-95.
- Oliver, R.L. (1981), Measurement and evaluation of satisfaction process in retail setting. *Journal of Retailing* 57 (Fall): 25-48
- Oliver, R.L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*, Irwin/McGraw-Hill, New York
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 pp.41-50
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality, *Journal of Retailing*.

- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L., Zeithaml, V.A. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale, *Journal of Retailing*, 67, 420-450.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., Berry, L.L. (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: implications for future research, *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 111-124
- Parker, A. (1995). Distance education attrition. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 1(4), 89-406.
- Peters, T.J., Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In search of excellence*, Harper & Row, NY.
- Peter, J.P. (1981). Construct validity: a review of basic issues and marketing practices, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 133-145.
- Peter, J.P., Gilbert A. Churchill, Jr. & Tom J. Brown (1993). Caution in the use of difference scores in consumer research, *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (4), 655-662
- Poh J.P. & Hauhariah, A. (2006). Measuring student's satisfaction for quality education in a e-learning university, *UniTAR E-Journal*, 2 (1).
- Rashid, M. Z. & Abdol Latif, L. (2005). Perceived service quality and satisfaction in distance education, *Proceedings of CRIDALA 2005 Conference*, OU Hong Kong, 20-22 June 2005, Hong Kong
- Rathmell, J.M. (1966). What is meant by services?, *Journal of Marketing*, 30 (October), 32-36.
- Reichheld, F., & Sasser, W. (1990). Zero defecting Institutional performance using ions: Quality comes to services, *Harvard Business Review*, 68 (5), 105-111.
- Reichheld, F.F. (1996). *The loyalty effect*, Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, MA,
- Rekkedal, T. (1972). Correspondence studies - recruitment, achievement and discontinuation. *Epistolodidaktika* 2, 3-38
- Rowley, J. (2003). Retention: rhetoric or realistic agendas for the future of higher education, *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 7 (6), 248- 253
- Ruyter, K., Bloemer, J., & Peter, P. (1997). Merging service quality and service satisfaction: an empirical test of an integrative model. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18, 387-406
- Saha, G. & Theingi (2009). Service quality, satisfaction, and behavioural intentions: a study of low-cost airline carriers in Thailand, *Managing Service Quality*, 9 (3), 350-372
- Seth, N., Deshmukh, S.G., & Vrat P. (2005). Service quality models: A review. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Measurement*, 22 (9). 913-949.

- Sewell, W., & V. Shah, (1967). Socioeconomic status, intelligence and the attainment of higher education. *Sociology of Education*, 40, 1-23.
- Sirisunyaluck, R. (1998). *Factors related to student attrition in the two-year bachelor's degree program in agricultural extension at Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University in Thailand: An application of Kemper's model*. PhD Dissertation, Mississippi State University
- Spady, W. (1970). Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. *Interchange*, 1970, 1, 64-85.
- Spaeth, J. (1970). Occupational attainment among male college graduates. *American Journal of Sociology*, 4, 632-44.
- Spreng, R.A. & Mackoy, R.D. (1996). An empirical examination of a model of perceived quality and satisfaction, *Journal of Retailing*, 72 (2), 201-214
- Summerskill, J. (1962). *Dropout from College*. In *the American College*, edited by N. Sanford, New York: Wiley, 1962
- Sureshchandar, G.S., Rajendran, C. & Anantharaman, R., N (2002). The relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction – a factor specific approach, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 16 (4), 363-379
- Sweet, R. (1986). Student dropout in distance education: An application of Tinto's model. *Distance Education*, 7(1), 68-91
- Szymanski & Henard (2001). Consumer satisfaction: A meta analysis of the empirical evidence, *Journal of the Academy of Sciences*
- Teas, K.R. (1993). Customer expectations and the measurement of perceived service quality, *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 57 (4), 18-24.
- Teas, K.R. (1994). Expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: an assessment of a reassessment, *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 132-9.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: a theoretical synthesis of recent research, *Review of Educational Research*, 45, 89-125
- Tinto, V. (1982). Limits of theory and practice in student attrition. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53, 687-700
- Trent, J. W. And L.L. Medsker. (1968). *Beyond high school*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1968
- Wang, S. J. (1999). *Factors of dropout/retention for distance education students at the National Open University of Taiwan*. PhD Dissertation, Ohio State University.

- Westbrook, R. A., & Michael D. R. (1983). Value-percept disparity: An alternative to the disconfirmation of expectations theory of consumer satisfaction, *Advances in Consumer Research* 10. Eds.
- Woodley, A., & M. Parlett (1983). Student drop-out, *Teaching at a distance*, 24, 2-23
- Wyckoff, S.C. (1999). The academic advising process in higher education: History, research and improvement. *Recruitment & Retention in Higher Education*, 13 (1), 1-3.
- Yi, Youjae. (1990). A critical review of consumer satisfaction. in Review of Marketing. Ed. Valarie A. Zeithaml, *Chicago: American Marketing Association*, 68-123
- Yorke, M (1999), *Leaving early: Undergraduate non-completion in higher education*, London: Falmer
- Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., & Parasumaran, A. (1996). The behavioural consequences of service quality, *Journal of marketing*, 60, 31-46

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A : BACKGROUND

Note: Please write your answers in the yellow boxes provided.

A0: Learning Centre

A1: Age (in years)::

A2: Gender (Male =1; Female = 0)

A3: RACE
 (Malays=1
 Chinese=2
 Indians=3
 Other Bumis=4
 Others=5)

A4: No of semesters completed

A5: Degree Programme attending
 (eg BBA, BAC)

A6: Principal occupation :
 (eg clerk)

A7 We would like to know more about your learning environment

NOTE: Give your answer : YES or NO

		Yes/No
a	I have time to study during my work day.	<input type="text"/>
b	My family is supportive of my study goal	<input type="text"/>
c	I have time to study at home	<input type="text"/>
d	I have set a goal to complete my degree programme	<input type="text"/>
e	I have difficulty balancing study with work & family commitments	<input type="text"/>

SECTION B: STATEMENTS OF SERVICE QUALITY

NOTE: Please indicate your degree of agreement for each statement by crossing with an 'X' in the appropriate box.

The scale is: 1:Strongly disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Somewhat disagree;
4: Neutral; 5 : Somewhat agree; 6: Agree; 7: Strongly agree

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B1	OUM has up-to-date equipment							
B2	OUM has physical facilities that are appealing							
B3	OUM's employees are well dressed and neat							
B4	OUM has attractive printed modules							
B5	When OUM promises to do something by certain date, it does so.							
B6	When you have problems, OUM is sympathetic and reassuring							
B7	OUM is dependable							
B8	OUM provides its services at the time it promises to do so							
B9	OUM keeps its records accurately							
B10	OUM tells its students exactly when its services will be delivered.							
B11	You do not receive prompt services from OUM's employees							
B12	Employees of OUM are not always willing to help							
B13	OUM's employees are too busy to respond to student requests promptly							
B14	You can trust employees of OUM							
B15	You can feel safe in your transactions with							
B16	Employees of OUM are polite							
B17	Employees get support from OUM to do their jobs well							
B18	OUM does not give you individual attention							
B19	OUM's employees do not give you personal attention							
B20	OUM's employees do not know what your needs are							
B21	OUM does not have your best interests at heart							
B22	OUM does not have operating hours convenient to its students							

SECTION C: OVERALL SERVICE QUALITY

NOTE: Please cross with an 'X' to rate the overall service quality

The scale is: 1:Very poor; 2: Poor; 3: Quite poor;

4: Neutral; 5 : Quite good ; 6: Good; 7: Excellent

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	Overall, the quality of OUM services is:.							
C2	Overall, the performance of OUM degree programme is:							

SECTION D: OVERALL SATISFACTION

NOTE: Please cross with an 'X' in the appropriate box to rate the overall satisfaction for the following OUM services.

The scale is: 1:Very dissatisfied; 2: Dissatisfied; 3: Quite dissatisfied ;

4: Neutral; 5 : Quite satisfied ; 6: Satisfied; 7: Very satisfied

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D1	Overall, how satisfied are you with the OUM services ?							
D2	Overall, how satisfied are you with the OUM degree programme?							

SECTION E: COMPLETE STUDY PROGRAMME

NOTE: Please cross with an 'X' in the appropriate box to indicate the degree of agreement for each of the statements.

The scale is: 1:Strongly disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Somewhat disagree;

4: Neutral; 5 : Somewhat agree; 6: Agree; 7: Strongly agree

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E1	I intend to complete my study at OUM							
E2	I doubt if I will complete my study programme at OUM							

APPENDIX B

FILE LAYOUT

Question	Description	Code
A0	Learning Centre	Text
A1	Age	18, 19
A2	Gender	Male=1, Female=0
A3	Race	Malay=1, Chinese=2, Indian=3, Other Bumis=4, Others=5
A4	No.of sem attended	1 to 15
A6	Degree Programme	Text
A5	Principal occupation	Text
A7A	I have time to study during my work day	Yes=1;No=0
A7B	My family is supportive of my study goal	Yes=1;No=0
A7C	I have time to study at home	Yes=1;No=0
A7D	I have set a goal to complete my degree programme	Yes=1;No=0
A7E	I have difficulty balancing study with work & family commitments	Yes=1;No=0
B1	OUM has up-to-date equipment	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B2	OUM has physical facilities that are appealing	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B3	OUM's employees are well dressed and neat	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B4	OUM has attractive printed modules	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B5	When OUM promises to do something by certain date, it does so.	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B6	When you have problems, OUM is sympathetic and reassuring	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B7	OUM is dependable	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B8	OUM provides its services at the time it promises to do so	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7

Question	Description	Code
B9	OUM keeps its records accurately	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B10	OUM tells its students exactly when its services will be delivered.	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B11	You do not receive prompt services from OUM's employees	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B12	Employees of OUM are not always willing to help	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B13	OUM's employees are too busy to respond to student requests promptly	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B14	You can trust employees of OUM	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B15	You can feel safe in your transactions with employees of OUM	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B16	Employees of OUM are polite	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B17	Employees get support from OUM to do their jobs well	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B18	OUM does not give you individual attention	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B19	OUM's employees do not give you personal attention	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B20	OUM's employees do not know what your needs are	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B21	OUM does not have your best interests at heart	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
B22	OUM does not have operating hours convenient to its students	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
C1	Overall, the quality of OUM services is:	Very poor=1 to Excellent=7
C2	Overall, the performance of OUM degree programme is:	Very poor=1 to Excellent=7
D1	Overall, how satisfied are you with the OUM services ?	Not satisfied at all=1 to Very satisfied=7
D2	Overall, how satisfied are you with the OUM degree programme?	Not satisfied at all=1 to Very satisfied=7
E1	I intend to complete my study at OUM	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7
E2	I doubt if I will complete my study programme at OUM	Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree =7